



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,477	07/18/2002	Andrew E. Fano	3383600003	9683
30498	7590	03/01/2005	EXAMINER	
VEDDER PRICE/ACCENTURE 222 NORTH LASALLE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60601				NGUYEN, CINDY
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2161		

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/064,477	FANO, ANDREW E.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Cindy Nguyen	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8, 10-25 and 27-29 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8, 10-25 and 27-29 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 July 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to amendment filed 12/17/04.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 12, 13, 15-20, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Platt et al. (US 20030009469) (Platt).

Regarding claim 1, Platt discloses: A method for media indexing comprising: capturing a subject in a media file with a media capture device (page 4, 0045, Platt); automatically receiving index information from an external source related to the subject (page 5, 0047 and page 6, 0055, Platt); and associating the index information with the media file (page 5, 0050, Platt)

Regarding claim 4, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 3. In addition, Platt discloses: wherein the media file storage device stores the media file and index information(databases, page 4, 0045 and 0049, Platt), the method further comprising at least one of the following: searching the plurality of stored media files using the index information and enabling a commercial system with

the plurality of stored media files using the index information (page 6, paragraph 0055, Platt).

Regarding claim 6, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 5. In addition, Platt discloses: wherein the step of receiving the index information is in response to an index information request (page 6, paragraph 0055, Platt).

Regarding claims 8 and 20, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Platt discloses: transmitting the index information relating to the subject to a media capture device (page 4 and 0045 and page 6, paragraph 0056, Platt).

Regarding claim 10, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8. In addition, Platt discloses: wherein the media capture device receives the index information and associates the index information with a media file (page 4 and 0045 and page 6, paragraph 0055, Platt).

As per claims 13 and 19, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

Regarding claims 3 and 15, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 13. In addition, Platt discloses: further comprising: providing the media file and the index information to a media file storage device (database) which comprises a plurality of stored media files (media objects)

having index information associated therewith (page 4, 0042, Platt); and storing the media file along with the plurality of stored media files (page 4, 0044, Platt).

As per claim 16, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 3, 4 and 15. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

Regarding claims 7, 12 and 17, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 8 and 13 above, respectively. In addition, Platt discloses: wherein the index information comprises at least one of the following: a time indicator, a landmark indicator, an event indicator, a global positioning system indicator, commercial information, a universal resource locator, and a proximity indicator (page 4, paragraph 0042, Platt).

Regarding claim 18, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 17. In addition, Platt discloses: wherein the index information enables a media file to be utilized by at least one commercial system, wherein the at least one commercial system comprises at least one of the following: a workflow system, a procurement system, a retail sales system, and a safety inspection/auditing system (fig. 1 and corresponding text, Platt).

As per claim 25, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 2. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

As per claim 27, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 5, 11, 14, 21-24, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Platt et al. (US 20030009469) (Platt) in view of Katseff et al. (US 5822537) (Katseff).

Regarding claim 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. However, Platt didn't disclose: wherein the step of associating the index information with the media file further comprises: encoding the index information into the media file. On the other hand, Katseff discloses: wherein the step of associating the index information with the media file further comprises: encoding the index information into the media file (col. 5, lines 51-to col. 6, lines 8, Katseff). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the steps for encoding the index information into the media file in the system of Platt as taught by Katseff. The motivation being to enable the system transferred and received the multimedia objects in the electronic format using imaging technology

Regarding claim 5 , all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Platt/Katseff discloses: wherein the index information,

prior to being associated with the media file, is transmitted from a media indexing beacon (col. 6, lines 25-40, Katseff).

Regarding claim 11, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8. In addition, Platt/Katseff discloses: wherein the index information is wirelessly transmitted to the media capture device (page 6, lines 45-48, Katseff).

Regarding claim 14, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 13. In addition, Platt/Katseff discloses: prior to providing index information from the media indexing beacon, further comprising detecting a user input to capture the media file (page 5, 0050, Platt); and providing an index information request to the media indexing beacon (page 6, lines 45-48, Katseff).

Regarding claim 21, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 11 and 19. In addition, Platt discloses: wherein the media indexing beacon further comprises: at least one index buffer comprising the index information (col. 15, lines 16-37, Katseff); and a transmitter operably coupled to the at least one index buffer, wherein the transmitter provides the index information to the media capture device (310, fig. 3 and corresponding text, Katseff).

Regarding claim 22, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 21. In addition, Platt discloses: wherein the media indexing beacon further comprises a receiver that receives an index information request from the media capture device, wherein the transmitter transmits the index information in response to the index information request (370, 340, 31, fig. 3 and corresponding text, Katseff).

As per claims 23 and 24, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 21 and 22. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

As per claim 28, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 21 and 27. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

As per claim 29, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 27. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CN
Cindy Nguyen
February 18, 2005

Frantz Coby
FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER